DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 627 JC 880 239

AUTHOR Witt, Allen A.
TITLE The Junior College Movement: An Historical Review.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Role; *Community Colleges; *Educational Change; *Educational History; Educational Trends; Literature Reviews; Postsecondary Education; Social Change; *Two Year Colleges; *United States History
IDENTIFIERS *Harper (William Rainey)

ABSTRACT

The origins and early history of the American junior college are examined in this essay, with reference to the differences between the junior college movement and its successor, the community college movement. The first section cites conflicting sources concerning the time period in which the junior college movement began, with cited dates varying from as early as the 1830s to as late as the 1940s. Arguing that two-year colleges established before the beginning of the 1900s were created to meet local or religious needs, the paper suggests that these early colleges were unconnected to the community college movement today. This section also examines the continuous increase in the number of colleges and enrollments since 1900, and highlights such significant dates as the awarding of the first associate degree in 1900 and the founding of early junior colleges. After noting the first applications of the term "movement" to the creation of public junior colleges, the essay discusses the dual nature of the "junior college movement," focusing on elitist efforts to separate the first two years of college education and reformist efforts to democratize higher education. Next, the synthesis of these two educational tendencies is examined, highlighting the role played by William Rainey Harper in establishing the purpose and direction of the junior college. Finally, a discussion is presented of the differences between the junior and community college movements, arguing that the comprehensive community college is a logical extension of the junior college movement. (MDB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294627

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE MOVEMENT: AN HISTORICAL REVIEW

by

Allen A. Witt

Institute of Higher Education

University of Florida

Gainesville, Florida 32611

1988

JC 880 239

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. L. Wattenbarger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Foreword

The Institute of Higher Education is pleased to present this brief historical review. We view this as merely preliminary to a much more comprehensive analysis that is underway. Proper credit to both L.V. Koos and W.R. Harper should be given. This is a first step!

James L. Wattenbarger

Gainesville, Florida 32611

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE MOVEMENT: AN HISTORICAL REVIEW

by

Allen A. Witt

Since its infancy at the turn of the century the American Community College has grown into the nation's dominant post-secondary delivery system. Clark Kerr (1985) ranked the "community college movement of the twentieth" century, along with the land grant college of the century before as the "two great innovations in [American] higher education"

> The community college movement became the great transformation into a learning society in which each person who wishes to do so can study almost any subject in almost any geographical community. (p. vii)

Even critics of the "movement" point out the unprecedented growth of this American "innovation. Steven Zwerling in his book Second Best (1976) observed that community college enrollments increased from "three hundred students in 1900 to more than two and a half million in 1974". He predicted that by the year 2000, "up to 70 percent of all college freshmen will first enroll at a public community college" (p. 42-43).

Despite general agreement on its size and scope, there seems to be little understanding and much confusion about the origins of the modern community college movement. The research reported in this article is designed to answer some of the most important questions, surrounding the origins and and early history of this "innovation" in American higher

education, including the following:

1) When did the initial junior college movement occur?

2) Who originated the term "junior college movement"?

3) How did the movement originate?

4) Is there an essential difference between the junior college movement and the comprehensive community college movement?

The Time Frame

Much of the confusion about the origins of the movement comes from a disagreement about the time period in which it began Some researchers place the "birth" of the movement as long ago as the 1830's (Blocker, Plummer, & Richardson, 1965), others in the 1850's (Landrith, 1971), while others see the movement as synonymous with the dramatic growth after the second world war. Each of these chronologies has its merits.

Researchers who place the origins of the modern community college movement in the 19th century, can point to numerous 2-year institutions, and extensions of the standard high school that were in operation before 1900. In fact there is considerable dispute as to the earliest dates for such institutions.

Thornton (1972) in his book The Community Junior College, began his chronology of the movement "as early as 1852" at Lasell Junior College, Auburndale , Massachusetts. Landrith (1971) also placed Lasell Junior College at the forefront of the chonology, but set the date as 1851 (p. 50).

Bogue (1950) in his volume The Community College began his chronology in the same year as Thornton, but at a different institution. Bogue pointed to an 1852 proposal by President Henry Tappan of the University of Michigan to remove the lower division. This proposal, followed by a similar proposal at the University of Georgia in 1859 was seen as the beginning of a movement.

Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson (1965) in their book The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis, moved the Thornton and Bogue chronologies back by 16 years to Monticello College, founded in 1835.

Perhaps the earliest date for the movement's birth was suggested by Doak Campbell in a 1929 address before the tenth convention of the American Association of Junior Colleges.

> I call your attention to a notable book in American education which was written at the suggestion of Thomas Jefferson, by DuPont de Nemours. This book, "National Education" was written at the beginning of the last century. In it the author outlines quite in detail...a secondary school which he calls a "college," and which rather closely fulfills the description of a junior college. (Campbell, 1929, p. 13).

In her book, Power and Politics in the Community College, Zoglin (1976) began her chronology of the "birth" of the community college with the "first public community college".

> Although there is disagreement as to where the first public community college was established (Greeley, Colorado, in the 1880's? Saginaw, Michigan, in 1895?...), the idea was certainly in the air at the time. (p. 3)

In his 1950 doctoral dissertation, J.L. Wattenbarger also began his chronology with the first "public junior college" but placed it at the University of Chicago "in 1896" (p. 52).

Without discussing the validity of each of these claims, they can be tested for the central characteristic of any movement, continuity. The 2-year colleges, established or proposed before the beginning of this century do not appear to be connected to a continuing movement. Instead, these colleges were individual efforts to meet local or religious needs.

Although they represent ideas that would surface again in the twentieth century, the proposals cited by Bogue and Campbell, were never actually implemented in the nineteenth century. The Georgia proposal was tabled and eventually abandoned during the War Between the States. The Michigan proposal was, likewise, dismissed and President Tappan "was fired for his elitist attitudes" (Ratcliff, p. 9). As for the proposal by Du Pont de Nemours, the original document was in French. When an acceptable English edition emerged in the ninteen-twenties, (Du Pont De Nemours 1923) the junior college movement was already well underway.

Claims of continuity between 2-year colleges of the nineteenth century, and the "movement" of the twentieth century are also refuted by enrollment data. According to a study by the American Council on Education (1967), in the year, 1900, America had only "about eight junior colleges--all private--with an enrollment of about 100". As Koos (1925) noted:

> A small number [of junior colleges] were reported to have been in existence before or at the

> opening of the century, but it is unlikely that they were established with anythng like a consciousness of the relationship of such establishment to a junior-college movement. (p. 8)

Researchers who refer to the junior/community college movement as post World War II phenomenon, however, can cite more impressive numbers. Between 1950 and 1970, the number of community colleges grew from 597 to over one thousand (American Council on Education [ACE], 1967). Student numbers grew even more impressively from "one-half million students in 1950 to five times that many in twenty-five years" (Zwerling, p. 42).

While such impressive growth certainly substiantites the presence of a movement, this movement was in existence long before the 1950s. In fact a continuity of growth can been shown from the very first years of the century. McDowell (1919), reported that

> Sixty-nine junior colleges have been organized since 1907, and more than half this number since 1915... The number of graduates from public junior colleges increased 211 per cent from 1915 to 1917.

Writing in 1925, Koos cited a continuous growth in junior colleges from eight campuses in 1900 to over 170 in 1921 (p. 3). Ten years later, that number had risen to 469 campuses (ACE p. 5).

Even more astounding are figures from The American Council on Education, indicating a growth in student numbers from one hundred students at the turn of the century to 97,631 in 1930 (ACE, p. 5).

As N. W. Walker, then president of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in the Southern States, noted in November, 1926

> The rapid rise of the Junior Colleges is one of the arresting facts of recent educational development in America. Within the past ten years the Junior College idea has been worked out in actual practice as perhaps no other single idea of so vast significance has ever been worked out in so short a period of time. (Walker, p. 28)

There is no doubt that factors such as the G.I. Bill of Rights, the Truman Commission Report, the civil rights movement, and the general democratization of higher education helped to sustain the movement into the second half of the century. Clearly, however, the movement existed and thrived many years prior to the second world war.

Although it is difficult to put an exact date on the beginning of the movement, a handy landmark is the awarding of the first "Associate of Arts, Philosophy, and Science" degree at the University of Chicago in 1900. Although that university had divided its upper division and lower division into separate "colleges" eight years earlier, no degree was conferred by the "junior college" until the first year of the century (Diener, p. 49-50).

This event was followed rapidly by the organization of a junior college at Mexico, Missouri in 1901 (American Association of Junior Colleges [AAJC], 1922) and the upward extension of public high schools at Joliet, Illinois in 1901, at Goshen, Indiana in 1904 and Detroit Michigan. As Blocker,

Plummer and Richardson (1965) reported

> The effort in Goshen, Indiana was short-lived, but Detroit Junior College in Michigan, continued to function and later became Wayne State University. Joliet Junior College is still a part of the public schools of that city. (p. 25)

These events were given added momentum by the 1907 California law extablishing lower division courses in public high school districts (Landrith, 1971). These related events mark the beginning of continuing junior college systems in Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, and California. They certainly, also represent the birth of a national movement.

Origins of the term "Junior College Movement"

The term "movement" was used to describe many educational innovations of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Harper (1903) viewed a proposal by several university presidents to condense the Bachelor of Arts into three years as a "movement".

> It is to be urged in opposition to the proposed movement that it is in general contrary to the drift of educational movements, and that the very thing which it proposes can easily be secured by other means. (p. 90)

McDowell (1918) described the national effort to standardize the two year period of instruction for normal schools as a "movement".

Koos (1927), viewed the advent of the junior high school as a movement.

> Many forces, not one or a few only, are responsible for the movement for educational reorganization finding expression in the present "junior high schools" (p. 1)

Walter Eells (1931) used the word "movement" in reference to the "6-4-4 plan" for reorganization of secondary education and in reference to the junior high school.

The university elitist scholars of the late nineteenth century were called a "movement".

> The leaders of this movement were men like Henry P. Tappan of the University of Michigan, Alexis F. Lange of the University of California, William W. Folwell of Illinois... (Zoglin, p. 3)

Kerr (1985, p. vii) and Diener (1986, p. 4) described the land grant universities of the late 1800s as a "movement"

Clearly the word "movement" was and is a common description of any major educational innovation that has experienced continuous growth over a period of time.

The word "movement", in reference to junior colleges, first appeared an account of a 1903 conference, held at the University of Chicago.

> At a meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools held in Chicago April, 1903, the present writer, after listening to a discussion of the movement to assign the first two years of college work as fifth and sixth years to the high schools, found himself compelled to differ on this question radically. (Sachs, 1905, p. 488)

The second use of "movement" to describe junior colleges occurred in an account of another conference, held in November, 1903. Once again the site was the University of Chicago. Stanley Brown, Superintendent of the six-year high school in Joliet, Illinois, reported to the conference.

> All over this state you may find, if you investigate, that within the past five years high schools offering...four years work have increased the work to five or six years. These movements have gone on, are going on, without any blare of trumpet. (University of Chicago, 1904, p. 20).

In 1906, the editors of the School Review, published by the University of Chicago, referred to the "movement", using the title "junior college".

> A number of private secondary schools are offering courses covering the first two years of college study (the junior college)...The movement toward the secondary school affording, in addition to the regular four-year course, two additional years "preparation for life," and articulating directly with the university (in distinction from the college), is slowly but steadily progressing. (p. 609)

The term "Junior College Movement" apparently first appeared in the literature in 1915. In May of that year, James R. Angell published a short (13 page) article in the School Review, titled, "The Junior-College Movement in High Schools". As President of Yale University, Angell had been introduced to the junior college while working with William Rainey Harper at the University of Chicago, according to Ratcliff (1987). In the introduction to this article, Angell stated.

> The college and university are often directly and always indirectly affected by the policy adopted by our high schools, and in the present junior-college movement they are likely to find their own organization and procedure radically affected. (p. 289)

The next scholarly reference to the "Junior College Movement" came in 1918, with F.M. McDowell's doctoral dissertation (later printed as a bulletin of the U.S. Bureau

of education), entitled The Junior College. In this first comprehensive study of the nation's 2-year institutions, McDowell (1919) concluded that

> The junior college movement has made rapid growth during the past 10 years.... We may conclude that it has appeared in response to certain fundamental needs, and hence that for the present at least it seems assured of a place in our system of education.

With the inception of the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC) in the summer of 1920, the term "Junior College Movement" came into common usage. It was used extensively in the early meetings and publications of the association, and was the title of the landmark 1925 book by AAJC researcher, Leonard V. Koos.

The Origins of the Movement

The history of a civilization is never a series of isolated ideas and occurrences. Instead, it is an unbroken chain of related thought and action, with each link dependent on the ones before it. Great historical "movements" are not created, but synthesized from ideas and movements of the past.

This historical synthesis is particularly evident in the junior college movement. An examination of the ideas and individuals involved in the early junior colleges reveals, not simply a new movement that emerged at the turn of the century, but a combination of at least two movements that had gained momentum since the mid ninteenth century. Blocker, Plummer,

and Richardson (1965) described the uneasy synthesis of these movements.

> The two-year college might be considered an historical accident growing out of the struggle between conservative thought and liberal thought...[Conservative thinkers envisioned] the highly specialized education of an intellectual elite...Liberal thinking insisted that public education be expanded to provide equal opportunities for all. (p. 32)

These two movements were labeled as the "elitest" movement and the "democratic" movement by Zoglin (1976).

> Thus did the elitist forces seeking to close universities to the masses and the democratic forces seeking to open higher education to them joined together to promote the community colleges. (p. 4)

The Elitist Movement

In the mid nineteenth century American society was undergoing drastic changes. The frontier nation of isolated towns, separated by distance and time was becoming increasingly centralized. The railroad, the telegraph, and easy access to printed material changed the national character.

Accompanying these changes were demands for change in higher education. The tiny isolated colleges of earlier years were giving way to major universities, with a specialized faculty, and increased emphasis on scientific research. Many leaders of these universities were impressed by the elitist German system of higher education, according to Diener

> Some critics of the day looked to other shores, looked to the roots of the new American society and its educational enterprises, seeking

> enlightenment for reform in the United States. Especially attractive was the German University (indeed the whole of the German educational system pleased many, too!) with its emphasis on scholarship, faculty specialization, and research. (p. 4)

One facet of the German system which particularly fascinated the American university leaders was the extended length of the secondary school. Koos (1925) noted.

> The idea of upward extension [of the high school] took its root in a comparison of European (more especially the German and the French) school systems with the American system... Among the defects of our system most frequently mentioned were the shorter period of secondary education here and the consequent responsibilities for much of general education left uncompleted by the lower units. (p. 236,236)

Among the early leaders of this movement were Professor Charles A. Joy of Columbia College, President William Watts Folwell of the University of Minnesota, and Henry Phillips Tappan of the University of Michigan. The views of this group were expressed by Tappan in his volume, University Education (1851).

> We have spoken of the German Universities as model institutions...They are purely universities, without any admixture of collegial [general education] tuition... Collegial tuition at the German Universities does not exist, because wholly unnecessary, the student being fully prepared at the Gymnasium [extended secondary school] before he is permitted to enter the university....The Gymnasia thus guard the entrance of the Universities. (p. 24)

The German primary and secondary schools, which Tappan and others praised consisted of the Vorschule and the

Gymnasium, respectively. According to Koos (1925), a student entered the Vorschule at six years of age. Assuming regular annual promotions, the student would complete the Oberprima, or highest class of the Gymnasium at "nearly eighteen" years of age. "Owing to delayed progress", however, the average Gymnasium student in 1890 finished the Oberprima at the age of "nineteen years and ten months". Koos noted that

> The upshot of all this...is that the student of the Gymnasium at the time of graduation is about as old as is the student in American colleges when he is near the end of his freshman year or well started on his sophomore year. (p. 240, 241)

Secondary schools, patterned after the German Gymnasium, were the gate keepers of the new university, envisioned by the elitist movement. Such schools would complete the general education process and deliver a student to the university who was broadly educated, approaching age twenty, and and ready to begin his specialization.

This movement was given added emphasis in the last two decades of the nineteenth century by the growth of the American high school, and the addition of land grant universities. Riding the swell of new high school graduates, university enrollment jumped from 52,000 in 1870 to 157,000 in 1890. To many elitist educators "it apparently seemed that the barbarian hordes were about about to descend on the sacred Halls of Academe" (Zoglin, p. 2,3).

As enrollment figures rose toward 238,000 at the turn of the century, a new generation of elitist scholars found hope

in the German model. This group included Alexis F. Lange, of the University of California, David Starr Jordan of Stanford, and William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago. Julius Sachs (1905) described the goals of this group.

> They are desirous of freeing the college curriculum of instruction that is analogous to secondary teaching. The adoption of what are called university methods in the third and fourth college years is largely responsible for the desire to delegate the work of the first two years to the secondary schools. (p. 489)

At the beginning of the twentieth century members of this elitist movement were in important positions in higher education. Their goal of removing the first two years of university education, however, demanded the cooperation of a second group that Zoglin (1976) refered to at the "democratic" movement.

The Democratic Movement

One of the remarkable trends in American democracy has been the gradual, but certain extensions of rights and opportunity. Voting rights, once enjoyed primarily by white, literate, males, were extended in cautious steps to all adult members of the society. Similar extensions have occurred in employment opportunity, freedom from racial and sexual discrimination, and freedom of conscience. No extension of democracy has been so pervasive or so powerful, however, as the democratization of education.

Since its beginning, America's public school system has extended itself horizontally to include more and more of the

population and vertically to include increased years of instruction. Zoglin (1976) chronicled the progress of this movement.

> It all began in the 1640's when the Puritan settlers established compulsory, tax-supported schools. From then on the public school system expanded steadily in response to an apparently insatiable demand for learning on the part of the American public. By 1850 free elementary education was the rule; secondary education, however remained the province of the private academies. As the number of elementary graduates grew, so did the pressure to provide schooling at public expense. Boston had a public high school as early as 1821; several hundred were in existence by the time of the civil war. The right of local boards of education to maintain free high schools and support them with public funds was affirmed by the landmark Kalamazoo case in 1874, thus clearing away the last legal obstacle to public secondary education. After that, growth was rapid: enrollment spurted from 72,000 in 1870 to 519,000 in 1900, with the number of graduates increasing from 16,000 to 95,000 in that same period. (p. 1-2)

With the expansion of the public school system to twelve years, it was only a matter of time before the demand grew for years thirteen and fourteen to be made universally available. As Koos (1925) noted

> Our public-school system has shown a consistent tendency to develop by extension at the top and ...the next "logical" step in its evolution is the addition of the freshman and sophomore years of college. (p. 25)

According to Doak Campbell (1929), a major "impulse", leading to the "birth" of the community college movement was "that rather intangible thing which we call democracy, endeavoring to express its needs in the form of organization". When that impulse toward democracy found itself stymied by the elitist attitudes of the university,

it sought expression in a new institution, the junior college.

A Synthesis of two Movements

It is indeed an historical irony that a marriage of convenience between the these two opposing camps resulted in the dominant higher education movement of the twentieth century. Some have called it an "historical accident" (Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson, p. 32). A closer examination, however, indicates that the synthesis was the deliberate product of one institution, and perhaps one individual.

In the earliest literature of the community college movement, one name crops up continually, William Rainey Harper. In 1892, Harper divided the upper and lower divisions at the University of Chicago. In 1895 he coined the term junior college "for want of a better name", to describe the lower division (Campbell, 1929). On July 1, 1899, he proposed the award of an "associate degree" by the junior college (University of Chicago, 1901).

These developments establish Harper as a leader in the early movement. Less known, however, is his role in nurturing and spreading the fledgling movement in the early years of the century. With a corps of professors, university presidents, and public school officials, this educational evangelist spread the gospel of the "junior college" thoughout the midwest, and then to California, and beyond.

Zoglin (1976) explained Harper's role as a promoter.

> And promote they did! Harper et al set about helping found community colleges, guaranteeing the transferability of their courses, spreading the word about their advantages, and even persuading state legislatures to pass laws encouraging their growth...At the very least, their contributions were those of midwife [at the birth of the junior college system]. (p. 4)

The stragegy used by Harper's movement was two-fold. The first plan was to modify many of America's foundering small colleges into junior colleges. In 1900, he indicated that there were "at least two hundred colleges in the United States in which this change would be desirable".

The second part of Harper's stragegy involved the "development of high schools into junior colleges". Although many students would still end their high school career after four years, Harper predicted that "at least 40 percent of those finishing the first four years would continue to the end of the sophomore year" (Harper, 1900).

Clearly Harper intended a nationwide movement that would radically alter the organization of American education.

Much of the initial effort was channelled through the University of Chicago's "affiliated and cooperating academies and schools". This group of elementary, secondary, and higher education leaders was charged in the fall of 1902 with developing a stategy for "the general reorganization of our system of education whereby there may be an elementary

school of six grades followed by a secondary school of six grades...to include the first two years of college". As Deiner (1986) noted, these leaders represented schools far beyond the Chicago area.

> [Evidence] indicates the rapidly growing influence of President William Rainey Harper and the University of Chicago...Harper was especially interested in improving secondary education through a network of cooperation and affiliation established between the University of Chicago and schools and academies in the Midwest, particularly illinois...Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, and Missouri. (p. 61)

In 1902 Harper's effort bore its first fruit at Joliet, Illinois, only about 25 miles from Harper's campus. At the November, 1903 "Conference of "Academies and High Schools Affiliating or Co-operating with the University of Chicago", the high school superintendent at Joliet reported on the success of the new six-year high school in that city.

> The work set forth enables the student completing the six years work to enter any professional school, such as law, medicine, dentistry, engineering, theology, etc., and also to enter upon pure university work at once, and without delay while he completes something [general education] he began in the lower school. (University of Chicago, 1904)

In 1904, when the high school at Goshen, Indiana was extended into six years, the board of education entered into a transfer agreement with President Harper, at the University of Chicago. (Hedgepeth, 1905).

> President W. R. Harper
> University of Chicago
>
> Dear Sir:-- We wish to assure you that the

> institution of the six-year high school plan in Goshen is permanent, and has the entire support of the board of education, and the hearty approval and patronage of the citizens. We wish to state, further, that we will do all we can toward placing the last two years' work on such a plane as will entitle pupils to college recognition.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> JOSEPH H. LESH
> FRANK KELLY
> GEORGE B. SLATE,
> Board of Education.

As the movement spread into other states, Harper and the University of Chicago remained the guiding force. When the first junior college was formed in Missouri, the president was a former student of the University of Chicago (AAJC, 1922). When the movement spread to California, Harper's influence was once again cited.

> It was in fact David Starr Jordan [of Stanford] who imported the idea of separating the upper and lower divisions. In 1902, he and William Rainey Harper had discussed the merits of encouraging small colleges to restrict their curriculum to the first two years of the baccalaueate. (Ratcliff, p. 9)

The unique character and reputation of William Rainey Harper made him the perfect mediator between the elitest forces of the large universities and the democratic forces from the public school.

To the elitist, Harper was a scholar of unquestioned credentials. At the tender age of 14, he graduated from college, "delivering the commencement address in Hebrew". At age 19, he had earned his Ph.D. from Yale in Semitic

languages. At the age of 35, he was installed as President of the University of Chicago (Diener, p. 49). A noted biblical scholar and expert in ancient languages, his translations and commentaries from Latin, Greek, and Hebrew made him one of the most noted intellects of his day.

To the public school official, however, Harper was a helpful educator. His writings and the reports of his conferences indicate an admiration for the work of the public schools. He brought leading secondary educators into the university setting and appropriated funds for their efforts.

In 1906, the first graduate of the a six-year high school completed her bachelor's degree. In reporting this first graduation, Superintendent J. Stanley Brown stated, "In her case is shown the completion of what Dr. Harper worked for" (Brown, 1906). In that same year, Harper died. He was 49 years of age.

The establishment of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1920 restored the national unity to the movement that the Harper group had begun. By that year, however, the junior college movement already included nearly 170 campuses.

The Community College Movement

There is a common belief among educators that the comprehensive community college movement differs substantially from the junior college movement of the first

half of the century. According to this view, the early junior colleges were limited to the freshman and sophomore years of an academic degree, while the community college offers terminal degrees, vocational education, and other educational services.

This supposed dichotomy, however, is not supported by the literature. From the very earliest dates, the junior college was seen to have a terminal function. Harper (1900) discussed the terminal function of the junior college.

> The student who was not really fitted by nature to take the higher work could stop naturally and honorably at the end of the sophomore year.

Angell (1915) reported that within the junior college movement there is

> a feeling in some quarters that the junior-college high school ought to strike out on its own lines in accordance with the special needs of the community, and that it should specialize particularly in industrial, engineering, and vocational directions, with its main interest centered on young people who will not go beyond the instuction it offers. (p. 295)

The California regulations of 1921, providing for the establishment of junior colleges in high school disticts included a provision for

> courses of instruction designed to prepare persons for agriculture, industry, commerce, home-making, and other vocations and such other courses of instruction as may be deemed necessary to provide for the civic and liberal education of the citizens of the community. (Ricciardi, p. 55)

By 1922, the official AACJC definition of junior

college included a broad scope of community and vocational education.

> The junior college may, and is likely to develop a different type of curriculum, suited to the larger and ever changing civic, social and vocational needs of the enter community in which the college is located. (AAJC, 1922, p.2)

In 1928, Nicholas Ricciardi, of the California Department of Education, reported on the growth of terminal education in his state at an AAJC conference. As a part of his presentation, Ricciardi introduced Arthur Paul, who had been developing terminal vocational courses "for the last five years at Riverside" Junior College. According to Paul, fifty of the 328 students at his institution were enrolled in terminal vocational programs. Similar vocational programs were reported at junior colleges in Sacramento and Santa Ana. (Riccardi, p. 58).

In the same year, John W. Barton, of the Ward-Belmont School in Nashville, Tennessee, reported that

> Recent surveys show that in addition to the peparatory at least three other functions are being recognized and increasingly emphasized by the junior college... [One of these is] the terminal function which undertakes to give the best possible preparation in a two-year course to that large body of pupils who will never go to the university--a preparation for life. (p. 49)

The early researcher who most clearly defined the dual nature of the community college movement was L. V. Koos. While summarizing the research that would be included in his later book, "The Junior College Movement", Koos (1922)

described possible conflicts between the terminal and transfer functions.

> The problem of the junior-college curriculum is one of great complexity and even greater moment. This problem is... also dual in nature. It is concisely, that of serving adequately the needs of students who will continue their training on higher levels--What I have designated elsewhere as the "isthmian" function--and those who will not, can not, and should not go on to these higher levels... Although it is only natural that one of the first concerns of those in charge of junior colleges is to "make good" with the higher institutions, the responsibility of providing for the second group is certain to loom larger and to call for the highest type of constructive ability. (p. 70)

The literature clearly indicates that the terminal function was anticipated at the inception of the junior college movement. The vocational function was in existence by at least the early 1920s, as were the other community service components of the comprehensive community college.

While it can be shown that the transfer function dominated the Junior College movement during the first half of the century, the seeds of the modern vocational and terminal functions were sewn in the early years of the movement. The comprehensive community college movement of the last half of the century, therefore, is a logical extension of the junior college movement, founded at the turn of the century.

REFERENCES

American Association of Junior Colleges (1922). The American Association of Junior Colleges Unpublished report, Author, Washington, DC.

American Council on Education (1967). An introduction to American Junior Colleges. Washington, DC: Author.

Angell, J.R. (1915). The junior-college movement in high schools. The School Review, 23, 289-302.

Barton, J. W. (December, 1928). Education for life as one of the objectives of the junior college. Paper presented to a meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Fort Worth, TX.

Blocker, C. E., Plummer, R. H., Richardson, R. C., Jr. (1965). The two-year college: A social synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bogue, J. P. (1950). The community college. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Brown, J. S. (1906).Editorial notes: The six year high school at work, The School Review. 14, 609-610.

Campbell, D.S. (1929). A brief study of the development of the junior college movement. Paper presented to a meeting of the American Association of Junior colleges, Atlantic City, NJ.

Deegan, W. L. & Tillery, D. (1985). Renewing the American community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Diener, T. (1986). Growth of an American invention. New York: Greenwood Press.

Du Pont De Nemours, P.S., (1923). National education in the United States of America. Newark, DL: University of Delaware Press.

Eells, W. C. (1931). What manner of child shall this be? Junior College Journal, 1, 309-328.

Gleazer, E. J. (1980). Values, vision, and vitality. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Harper, W.R., (July, 1900). Changes affecting the small college which may be expected and which may be desired. Paper presented to a meeting of the National Education Association, Charleston, SC.

Harper, W.R., (July, 1903). The length of the college course. Paper presented to a meeting of the National Educational Association, Boston.

Hedgepeth, V.W.B. (1905). The six-year high school at Goshen, Indiana. 13, 19-23.

Henry, N. B. (Ed.). The public junior college. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education.

Kerr, C. (1985). Forward. In W.L. Deegan & D. Tillery, Renewing the American community college (pp. vii-xi). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Koos, L.V. (March, 1922). Continued growth of the junior junior college movement. Paper presented to a meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Chicago.

Koos, L.V. (1925). The junior college movement. Boston: Ginn and Company.

Koos, L.V., (1927). The junior high school. Boston: Ginn and Company.

Koos, L.V. (1970). The community college student. Gainesville: University of Florida Pess.

Landith, H. F. (1971). Introduction to the community junior college. Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers and Publishers.

McDowell, F.M. (1919). The junior college. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office. (Bureau of Education Bulletin 1919, No. 35).

Ratcliff, J.L. (November, 1987). Anthony Caminetti, university leaders and the 1907 California junior college law. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Baltimore, MD.

Reed, L. D. (1971). Jesse Parker Bogue: Missionary for the two year college. New York: Carlton Press.

Ricciardi, N. (March, 1928). The development of terminal courses in the junior colleges in California. Paper presented to a meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Chicago.

Sachs, J., (1905). The elimination of the first two college years: A protest. Educational Review. 30, 488-489.

Tappan, Henry, (1851). University education. New York: G.P. Putnam.

Thonton, J. W., Jr. (1972). The community junior college. Third edition. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

University of Chicago, (1904). Proceedings of the seventeenth educational conference of the academies and high schools affiliating or co-operating with the University of Chicago. The School Review. 12, 1-28.

University of Chicago (1901). The associate degree University Record. 5, 12-13.

University of Chicago (1903). The high school of the future. The School Review. 11, 1-3.

Walker, N.W. (November, (1926). The significance of the junior college movement. Paper Presented to a meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Jackson, MS.

Yarrington, R. (Ed.). (1969). Junior colleges: 50 states 50 years. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Zwerling, L. S. (1976). Second best. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Zoglin M.L. (1976). Power and politics in the community college. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges JUL 01 1988